

ANALECTA SYRIACA.^a

A WORK has been recently published under the above title, consisting of a series of selections from the Syriac MSS. in the British Museum. The editor, Dr. A. P. de Lagarde, has already distinguished himself by his publications of ancient documents in ecclesiastical literature, and is well known as a philologist whose attainments are both extensive and accurate. In common with others his attention was directed to the fine collection above referred to, and he visited this country for the purpose of examining it and making extracts. One result of his labours is now before us in the form of an elegantly printed volume of somewhat more than two hundred pages. As this volume has only been printed in a very limited impression, is almost entirely without notes, and wholly without translations, and is at the same time one of considerable interest, although in a language known to comparatively few, we propose to give a short account of its contents. We shall also add a few translations of passages which come within the scope of this Journal, and which appear to be worthy of especial attention.

The prolegomena^b mainly consist of verbal criticisms. The Syriac text may be divided into two parts: first, the series of extracts from Christian writers; and, secondly, those from ancient heathen authors. The Christian writers are Sixtus or Xystus, bishop of Rome, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Julius bishop of Rome, Hippolytus, Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and George an Arabian bishop. The second class comprises Aristotle, Socrates, Isocrates, Plutarch, Pythagoras, Diocles, and an anonymous life of Alexander the Great. Our concern will be chiefly with the former.

1. *Sixtus* or *Xystus*. Under the name of this person a work was published in 1725, by Siber at Leipsic.^c In the opinion of its editor it was composed by Sixtus the Second, who was elected to the Roman see in A.D. 257. Subsequent critics, however, have laboured to shew that it was not only a spurious work, but the composition of a heathen.^d As we have not the volume at hand we are unable to say, but we suppose it bears a close resemblance to that from which extracts are here printed. These

^a P. Lagardii *Analecta Syriaca*. M.DCCC.LVIII. Lipsiæ formis suis excudebat, B. G. Teubnerus. Exemplaria facta cxv. Londini: prostat apud Williams et Norgate.

^b pp. 3—20.

^c *Sixti II. Enchiridion*. U. G. Siber: Lipsiæ, 1725. This work is a series of 460 moral Apophthegms, translated by Rufinus.

^d Compare also Jerome on Ezekiel, ch. xviii., and elsewhere; and Augustine, *Retract.*, lib. ii., cap. 43. Other spurious writings are extant, under the same name.

are certainly the work of a Christian author, and are claimed by Dr. de Lagarde for Sixtus I., who became bishop of Rome in A.D. 116. If this editor's view be correct, and he refers to Origen in support of it, we have here remains of the earliest Christian antiquity, and which come between those of Ignatius and Polycarp.⁶ A careful examination of the three pieces printed has satisfied us of their high antiquity, but we are by no means prepared to endorse the judgment of the editor. The writer was a man of a meditative and philosophical turn, and his precepts and maxims have a peculiarly ethical and philosophical character. Sometimes the expressions employed remind us of the mystical writers of the later ages, and at other times we are reminded still more forcibly of the writers of the later stoical school. It would be easy to illustrate these observations by examples, but as the editor wishes to reserve for himself this particular portion of his book, we shall make no extracts.⁷ At the same time, we do not admit his claim to be the discoverer of these remains, which were examined by the writer of this several years ago.⁸ We will only remark further, that Sixtus, whoever he was, seems to have been far removed from ritualistic tendencies, possessed and was well acquainted with the whole collection of the sacred books, and lived at a time when men had learned to philosophize and make nice distinctions. It may be well to add, that a *Treatise on the Love of God* is among the works recorded to have been translated from Greek into Syriac; and, that the Syriac of the remains before us is remarkably pure, and free from Greek words, as compared with compositions of known recent date.

Let us come, then, to Gregory of Neocæsarea, or Thaumaturgus, who flourished in the middle of the third century. Like many others of early date, only a small portion of his works have come down to us, and others, not his own, have been attributed to him. The remains here published are partly new to us, and partly consist of spurious, or at least doubtful compositions. The first is a very short extract from a discourse to Gajanus on the soul, to this effect: "Since, therefore, the soul is simple, and does not consist of diverse parts, it is neither

⁶ In the opinion of Dr. de Lagarde, Sixtus was probably adisciple of the apostle James, which is, however, very unlikely, as James is said to have suffered while the temple was yet standing.

⁷ A single instance may seem to explain what we mean by the philosophical and mystical tendencies of the writer. "Whenever thou prayest, and thy prayer is received before God, know and see that thou receivest a great gift from God. For every man who is like God (or worthy of God), is a God among men. Now there is a God, and there is a Son to God, in one equality with the Spirit of Holiness."

⁸ It does not appear that the editor has consulted all the manuscripts containing remains of compositions ascribed to this author.

composite nor dissoluble, and therefore neither corruptible nor mortal." The second is on the faith in sections, and is regarded as not genuine.^k The next is a discourse or tract to Philagrius on the co-essential. The fourth is a treatise on the impassibility or passibility of God, and is a discussion or dialogue with a certain Theopompous, who seems to have been affected with the heresy of the Patripassians, who held that God the Father must have suffered on the cross. This is the longest of the pieces, and is complete. It is of considerable interest, and has been copied from a manuscript written as far back as A.D. 562. Following this are a few fragments from a discourse upon the Resurrection, from a discourse upon the Faith;ⁱ from another upon the Incarnation and Faith; and from discussions upon the nature of Christ.

After Gregory comes Julius of Rome, elected A.D. 337, represented by seven or eight extracts.^k First, from an epistle to Dionysius^l against Paul of Samosata: secondly, from an epistle to Prosidicus on the Trinity: thirdly, an extract on the divinity of Christ: fourthly, from an encyclical epistle on the same subject: fifthly, an extract upon the Advent of God: sixthly, from a discourse on the Incarnation: seventhly, from a discourse against such as oppose the doctrine of the Incarnation: eighthly, on the unity of Christ, and of the union of his composite body with his divinity. All these extracts belong to the great Arian controversies of the time, and as such are interesting, but present no points requiring special observation.

We, therefore, pass on to Hippolytus, whose name has of late years come very prominently before the public, and who belongs to the first quarter of the third century of the Christian era.^m The extracts are eight in number, and with the exception of the canons and a single passage on the Epiphany,ⁿ are all the remains of this writer which exist in the collection at the British Museum, so far as we are aware. The first is a selection of passages from the exposition of the prophet Daniel.^o As this is not of great extent, and is a curious specimen of the mode of interpreting that prophet at a comparatively early period, a rough version of the whole of it is here presented to the reader.

^k The Greek title is *ἡ κατὰ μέρος πίστις*, and it is extant in Latin.

ⁱ Extant in Latin and not genuine.

^k It is the intention of the editor to publish all that remains of Julius, in Greek. At the same time we hope he will add the Syriac fragments he has here omitted.

^l Mentioned by Gennadius as an epistle to Dionysius of Corinth.

^m The editor promises to publish an edition of all the Greek remains of Hippolytus.

ⁿ Or more properly on the first Sunday in Epiphany.

^o Photius mentions this in his *Bibliotheca Cod.* 202. A manuscript of part of it, at least, is or was extant at Rome, according to Mabillon.

"Select Sentences from the Book of the Holy Hippolytus, the Exposition of Daniel the Prophet, taken as by force only."

"This doctor^p says of Nebuchadnezzar, that he reigned twenty-five years; eighteen before he saw the dream of the tree (Dan. iv. 10, etc.), and seven after the vision, and these were beside the time that he was driven out, seven times as it is written concerning him. Now he says, these seven times were either seven years, or seven changes of the year of three months each; I mean harvest and winter, and autumn and spring. Now of Evilmerodach the son of Nebuchadnezzar, he says, that he reigned twelve years after his father, and then Belteshazzar after him four years.

"And of the vision of the beasts which Daniel saw (Dan. vii. 1, etc.), he says, that the first beast, which was like a lion, was the kingdom of the Chaldeans; the second, which was like a bear, was the kingdom of the Persians, and the three ribs which were in its mouth, were the Medes, and Babylonians, and Assyrians: and this continued two hundred and thirty years; or, according to other writers, two hundred and forty-five years, until the reign of Alexander the Macedonian, king of the Greeks, which was the third beast, like a leopard.

"Now, when it is said that the beast had four wings, this is, that after the death of Alexander, his kingdom was divided to four chiefs, who were of his family, and the sons of his bringing up:^q I mean Seleucus, and Demetrius, and Philip, and Ptolemy. And after the kingdom of the Greeks had continued three hundred years; after it, the kingdom of the Romans prevailed, which was the fourth beast, which was very much more terrible, and hard as iron. And the ten horns which were upon its head, he says, were ten kings who were to arise in it at the same time. And the little horn, again, which sprang up among them afterwards, before which three of the ten were rooted out, this is Antichrist. And the three which were rooted out before it, are the king of Egypt, and the king of Cush, and the king of Libya. These three kings he slays, but the remaining seven he reduces to subjection. Now his birth is of the tribe of Dan.^r

"And again, he speaks thus of those things which were in

^p The copyist frequently calls Hippolytus Doctor, in accordance with Syriac usage. The closing words of the title clearly mean that these extracts are fragmentary and not consecutive: we have, therefore, put them as separate paragraphs. The translation is very nearly literal. We have followed the usual English spelling of the proper names.

^q Or, adopted Sons.

^r In his opinion, therefore, Antichrist was to be a Jew. The reasons why Antichrist was expected from Dan were chiefly derived from Gen. xlix. 17, where Dan is called a serpent; and Rev. vii., where the name of Dan is omitted. This opinion prevailed both in the East and in the West.

another vision:—The ram which appeared was Darius the Persian king, and the strong he goat, Alexander, king of the Greeks (Dan. viii. 1, etc.), and his high horn was broken off, and four came up instead of it; this is, that after his death his kingdom was divided to four kings, as is said above. And this, that from one of them proceeded one horn, which grew great and reached to heaven, is for the hosts of Antiochus Epiphanes. He conquered Egypt, and went up to Jerusalem in the time of the Maccabees; and judged and slew many of the Jews, and abolished the sacrifice and oblation, and did all those things which are written by the prophet, one thousand three hundred days, three years and a half. And afterwards arose Judas Maccabeus, and warred with the army of the host of Antiochus, and slew many of them, and drove them from his land, and took the city of Jerusalem, and purified the temple, and consecrated the holy' (things and places) as before, as it is written in the book of Maccabees. And of these things thus (he speaks).

"Now concerning the vision of the weeks (Dan. ix. 24, etc.), the doctor speaks in this way—for the angel divided these seventy weeks into three times. And first, he says, thus: to Messiah the governor, seven weeks, which are forty-nine years. Now Daniel saw this vision in the twenty-first year of the captivity; when, therefore, these forty-nine are added to the twenty-one, they make up the seventy years which Jeremiah said the people were in Babylon. And here, Joshua the son of Jozedec, the high priest, who went up at the head of the people from Babylon, is called Messiah the governor. And afterwards, the sixty-two weeks, which made four hundred and thirty-four years. Now, after the people returned from Babylon, there were four hundred and thirty-four years to the coming of the Messiah.* Then, indeed, should come Messiah, who was everlasting righteousness. And Messiah, the holy of holies, both forgave sins and put away the guilt of believers, and accomplished the visions and the prophets. And then, when the times were determined and ceased, and the covenant was appointed unto many, the last week should come, which was left, after the Gospel was preached in all the world, and the end cometh, wherein cometh Elias and Enoch. In the middle of this (week) the Pollution of desolation, Antichrist appears, who announces desolation to the world. When he cometh, the sacrifice and drink-offering, that which is now offered in the churches, shall be taken away."

* Literally "renewed the holies."

† This agrees with the usual computation. Hippolytus manifestly believed without suspicion, the early origin and really prophetic character of the Book of Daniel.

" The word rendered sacrifice is not necessarily an offering for sin; if, however, as

"And again, concerning those things which were in another vision, he thus speaks: (Dan. xi. 1. etc.) These three kings, who should arise in Persia, and the fourth, who should enrich himself with great wealth, are these: Darius, who was after Cyrus, and Artaxerxes, and Ahasuerus,^v and the fourth, Darius the latter." And afterwards, he says, shall arise a mighty king, and shall enter the borders of the kings of Egypt. This is Antiochus Epiphanes, who compelled the Jews to transgress the law, and to sacrifice and eat swine's flesh. Against him fought Mattathias and his sons, the Maccabees,^z and they thrust out his hosts from their borders, as is said above; and they were helped with a little help.

"And again, concerning the daughter of the king of Egypt, (see Dan. xi. 6), he says, that she came with her two sons, Alexander and Ptolemy Philometor, to make covenants of peace with Antiochus, king of Syria. And when she came to Beishan, there she was slain, because he that was conducting her delivered her up.^y And afterwards Ptolemy reigned in Egypt, and came and made war with Antiochus, and when he prevailed over him, and Antiochus fled and came to Antioch, Ptolemy took all their arms, and their gold, and their silver, and their idols, and carried them to Egypt. And afterwards, Antiochus returned and assembled a great army, and made war again with the king of Egypt, and overcame him. And from thence he went up to Jerusalem, and wasted and overthrew whatever he pleased, and compelled the Jews to defile themselves, as is said above; and afterwards he went to Persia, and there he died.

"And again; after these things, there arose, as king, a man whose name was Alexander: and he held the kingdom of Syria, and sent to Ptolemy, king of Egypt, and said to him—"Give me Cleopatra, thy daughter, to wife." And Ptolemy took his daughter, and came to the city of Ptolemais, which is Accho, and gave her to Alexander as wife. And, when he saw the realm and land of Alexander, and coveted it, he plotted against him, and spake with him deceitfully at one table (*compare* Dan. xi. 27), as it is written, and devised evil against him. And he returned to Egypt, and gathered a great army, and came and fell upon the land of Syria, when Alexander was himself gone to Cilicia,

it seems, the Eucharist is meant by the "sacrifice," and we do not see what else can be intended, it is a curious example of the word with that reference, at so early a period.

^v Probably the same as Xerxes.

^y Or, Darius the second.

^z The reader will notice the repeated allusions to the Book of Maccabees, although no opinion is expressed as to its canonical authority.

^y Or, "betrayed her." *Beishan* is Bethshean or Scythopolis.

and his wife Cleopatra was left at Accho. And Ptolemy came and took away his daughter, and gave her to Demetrius. And when Alexander heard these things, he came and made war with Ptolemy and Demetrius; but when his army was not able to withstand them, he fled to the king of the Arabians, and was slain there. And Ptolemy took the government, and put on the crown of Egypt and of Syria; and after three days he died. And the Scripture was fulfilled which said—‘and in a few days he shall be broken,’ and ‘they shall not give to him the glory of the kingdom’ (*comp.* Dan. xi. 20, 21.)

And again, concerning this which is written—“And a daring king shall arise, and shall be lifted up above every god, shall be great, and shall speak great things, and shall prosper” (*comp.* Dan. xi. 36); the doctor saith, this is Antichrist. He layeth waste many lands and cities, Egypt, for example, and Cush, and the land of Libya: and he shall be exalted above every god and deity; “thinking of himself that he is god.”^a And he will build Jerusalem and the temple, and gather the people of Israel from all lands, and reign over them, and they shall worship him as God, proclaiming that he is the Messiah. He will slay the two witnesses and ambassadors of the Messiah, who preach his coming from heaven—that is, Enoch and Elias, as is said in another prophet.^a And he will give to the two witnesses to prophecy twelve hundred and sixty days, arrayed in sackcloth: as also Daniel says, “He shall appoint a covenant to many one week, and it shall be in the middle of the week, the sacrifice and the drink offering will be taken away (Dan. xi. 27). That one week being divided into two times, these two witnesses will preach three years and a half; but Antichrist, the other part of the week, will make war with the saints, and waste and destroy all the people of the Lord, in order that that may be fulfilled also, which is said, ‘and they shall give the abomination of desolation, about^b a thousand, two hundred and ninety days:’ and afterwards, says the prophet, ‘Blessed is he that endureth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days’ (Dan. xii. 12). Daniel says, therefore, that two abominations should come: one of corruption, and one of desolation.

^a 2 Thess. ii, 4. The word rendered deity agrees with the Greek *σέβασμα*—an object of reverence and worship.

^a *Comp.* Rev. xi. 1—14; and Mal. iv. 5. No prediction scriptural of Enoch’s second coming occurs to us; but his return along with Elijah was very generally expected both in the east and in the west. See quotations from Joannes Darenis (end of fifth century) and others, in *Euoplia Fid. Cathol.*, p. 398, etc., ed. F. Nairon; Suicer’s *Thesaurus*, s. voc. *ἀντίχριστος*; *Sermones* Hugon Pratensis, .iii.; *Methodii Revelationes*, s. fin; and many other evidences of this opinion.

^b Or, “as it were,” the expression is vague.

That of corruption is Antiochus, and that of desolation is Antichrist; and the one, he says, should continue thirteen hundred days, three years and a half; but the latter twelve hundred and ninety days. 'Blessed is he that endureth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred thirty and five days.' For when the abomination cometh and warreth with the saints, every one that survives its days, and shall draw near before him the other forty-five days, will attain to the coming of the Messiah and the kingdom of heaven.

"And again, on this he says; 'For a time, times, and half a time' (Dan. xii. 7), he means three years and a half, which are the time of the dominion of Antichrist. For he calls a year a time, but two years and a half, times, and half a year, half a time. These are the twelve hundred and ninety days, which Daniel mentioned before, and when the forty-five others of the end of the rebellion shall be added to these, then shall the Judge of judges be revealed from heaven, and the resurrection shall be, and the kingdom of heaven shall be given to them that are worthy."

Those things of holy Hippolytus which are from the exposition of Daniel, the prophet, end.

It is with much pleasure that we give the preceding extracts in an English dress, and bring them for the first time before the notice of Bible readers; for although their existence was known some years since by a few individuals, their publication by Dr. de Lagarde affords us a favourable opportunity of making them more generally accessible. The fragments in question are but a small portion of many precious relics of ancient expositions of scripture and other writings, contained in the volume from which they have been taken, and which is entitled "Plerophoria, or defence of the orthodox and apostolical faith," i.e., the faith received in the council of Chalcedon. Among the writers quoted in this volume are, Dionysius of Alexandria, Julius of Rome, Peter of Alexandria, Athanasius, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Epiphanius, Ignatius, Irenæus, Alexander of Alexandria, Basil, Chrysostom, Origen, Cyril, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Jacob of Edessa, John of Asia, Zacharias the church historian, George the Arabian, and many more. The extract above given, is one, the criticism of which we leave to others, and we are quite sure it will be received with interest by the students of prophetic interpretation. As an appropriate supplement to it, we will give another extract from the same manuscript volume, and also printed by Dr. de Lagarde. It will be found at p. 115 of his book, in a

letter from George, an Arabian bishop,^c along with a passage from Bardesanes, already published by Mr. Cureton in his *Spicilegium Syriacum*, and Jacob the Persian, etc. To this we may have occasion to return. In the meantime we quote the following.

“Holy Hippolytus also, Bishop and Martyr, thus speaks in the fourth discourse upon Daniel the prophet.

“For the first coming of our Lord in the flesh, at Bethlehem, was in the days of Augustus Cæsar, in the year of the world 5505.^d And he suffered in the year 33 after his nativity. Now it behoves, of necessity, that six thousand years should be fulfilled, that the sabbath of rest may come, wherein God resteth from all his works, which God began to perform.

“And after a little—From the coming of the Messiah, therefore, we must reckon and bring down five hundred years, those which remain to the completion of the six thousand years, and so shall the end be.

“And this again, more openly, holy Hippolytus says, when he wishes, also, to shew that this world is not to exist more than six thousand years only. And these things are thus. But we must know that according to his opinion, this world has existed two hundred and fifteen years beyond the time, in this year of the Greeks, 1025. For if, after the coming of the Messiah, five hundred years, the six thousand years end, and this world too, as he says: but from the coming of the Messiah until the present year there are seven hundred and fifteen years, (because we reckon that the Messiah was born in the year 310, as we shew more carefully in another place); therefore, when we deduct from seven hundred and fifteen years, the five hundred years, as Hippolytus says, we have a remainder of two hundred and fifteen years, as also we said.”

We have given not only the exposition of the opinions of Hippolytus upon the world's duration, but the chronological calculations by which his mistake is proved. This is a very good case for such as require us to follow “unanimous consent of the fathers” in interpreting scripture. We leave it for their consideration. In the meantime, however, we think students of chro-

^c If we return to this work, we shall have occasion to say more of this George, who belongs to the former part of the eighth century, as he himself explains in the following passage.

^d The so-called Alexandrian era was calculated from B.C. 5502.

nology, will be gratified with the figures contained in both the preceding citations. For students of another class, we shall proceed to give another extract, a scholium on the Book of Psalms, containing an account of the authors of the separate Psalms, the time and occasion when they were written, their arrangement, etc. This, also, well deserves careful examination.

“Again of the same Holy Hippolytus: a Scholium on the distinction of the Psalms.”

“The Psalms are in all 150, but they are not all David’s, as men fancy, but also of other psalmists, whom David chose and constituted chief of the psalmists of the tribe of the Levites. They were these, Asaph, Heman, Ethan, and Jeduthun. To these four psalmists he joined 288 men. To each of them were joined seventy-two men, who sang with instruments of music. These seventy-two psalmodists he appointed as a prophet, in the mystery of the seventy-two nations whose tongues were confounded of old, with this figure, that all nations should praise God. For they that sought to build a tower at that time were seventy-two nations, who were Atheists;^f but when righteous wrath was upon them there was a division into seventy-two tongues; and when they were not alike in speech they came to enmity, when they were subjected under 288 chieftains, and by them they were thrust out. Now they who were then scattered, when they were driven from the east, after they had dared to build the tower, were these: of Ham thirty-two; of Shem twenty-five; and of Japhet fifteen; who were seventy-two in all; for hereby was it prophesied, that all tongues at the end of time should praise God.^g

“Now all the Psalms are 150, as was said.

“Without inscriptions two, 1 and 2.

“Of David 72, and 72 thus: the 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 42, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 85, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 102, 103, 107, 108, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143: which are together 72.

“Of David again, 8, thus: the 16, 25, 26, 27, 36, 100, 109, 144, which are together 8.

^f The word rendered “Atheists” is ܐܠܗܝܬܝܢ. It resembles nearly ἄθεοι, but is not in the lexicons. A noun or adjective is required, and this very well suits the connexion. We are not aware where Hippolytus got his classification of languages and nations.

^g We have broken up the text in what follows to shew the arrangement.

"Of the sons of Korah 11, thus: the 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 83, 84, 86, 87; which are together 11.

"Of Asaph 12, thus: 49, 72, 73 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82; which are together 12.

"Of Jeduthun 2, thus: 38, 61.

"Of Solomon 1: the 71st.

"Of Heman the Israelite 2:^h the 87, 88.

"Of Moses 1: the 89th.

"Anonymous 5: the 65, 66, 91, 99, 101.

"Songs of degrees 15,ⁱ—

"Ten anonymous, thus: 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 128, 129, 131.

"Five with inscriptions,—

"Of David 4, thus: 121, 130, 132, 133.

"On Solomon 1: the 126th.

"Again the Psalms, Hallelujah, 20,—

"Fifteen anonymous, thus: 104, 105, 106, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 134, 135, 149, 150.

"Those which are inscribed 'Of Haggai and of Zechariah' 4, thus: the 145, 146, 147, 148.

"All the Psalms together, 150.

"Now all those are anonymous which have inscriptions but do not shew whose they are, as the 65th, which is inscribed 'song of a psalm of the resurrection;' and the 66th, which is inscribed 'at the end in songs, a psalm of a song;'^k and the 91st, which is inscribed 'a psalm of praise upon the Sabbath-day;' and, again, the 99th, which is inscribed, 'a psalm upon thanksgiving.' There are, then, 31 anonymous, but 119 with inscriptions, altogether 150, as we said.

"The inscriptions then teach us whose the psalm is, or upon whom it is spoken. For when one says 'a psalm to the sons of Korah,' Asaph and Ethan say it; and when it says 'a psalm to Jeduthun,' Jeduthun is the psalmist. But when it says 'to David,' it is David himself who says it; and when, again, it is said 'of David,' it is spoken by others upon David.

"Since, then, the songs are various, and not all of them are psalms of David, perchance one says, 'Why are all of them reckoned to David, and named after him?' And we say, Because he was the occasion of them, for he chose the psalmists, and therefore this honour comes to him, and all those things which the psalmists said are reckoned David's. And we will bring yet

^h So called also in the LXX.

ⁱ Or, "Of going up."

^j Or, "At the end in praises, a psalm of praise."

another testimony which establishes this. The Book of Esther and of Mordecai is adduced.¹ Now Esther does some one thing alone, but of the rest Mordecai does everything, and it is not inscribed The Book of Mordecai, but of Esther; and the reason of this is, that when she was queen she gave herself wholly for the people, and therefore in honour of her it is called the Book of Esther. In this manner, therefore, when she was the cause of the deliverance of Mordecai, it was inscribed the deliverance of Esther, and the book was accounted hers. In this manner, also, concerning David, who was the cause of the praises of the Word which relates to God,^m the Book of Psalms is reckoned his.

"The sons of the Hebrews divided the whole Book of Psalms into five parts.

"The first of them is from the 1st to the 40th.

"The second, from the 41st to the 71st.

"The third, from the 72nd to the 88th.

"The fourth, from the 89th to the 105th.

"The fifth, from the 106th to the end of the book.

"Now we must observe that this order of the Psalms runs and is constituted without adherence to the chronology. Now, this changes a number of times, as the Book of Kings shews." Therefore Ezra, who, with the other books of the prophets, and had care of a collection of psalms, did not find them all at one time, but at various times; and on this account he arranged those first which he found first, and afterwards those which were found by degrees. On this account also, those of David were not arranged after one another, but among those of the sons of Korah, Asaph and Ethan; and again also, of Moses and of Solomon; and afterwards those of David again are to be found, arranged without order in the book, and not according to the times which are spoken of in them, but according to the times in which they were found; and hence it happened, that those first in time, being found afterwards, are arranged second in order. The same thing thou canst also find happens in the books of the prophets, for one follows the order of its history, but another varies because of the time of its finding.^o And this is known by the histories on account of which these psalms were spoken. For the 58th psalm was spoken upon Saul's

¹ This reference to the Book of Esther deserves the notice of the reader.

^m This seems only to mean that David was the occasion of the hymns of Holy Scripture.

ⁿ He says Book of Kings, and not Books, because they were commonly regarded as one

^o Every one knows that the Prophets are not chronologically arranged in the Bible.

sending to slay David; and psalm 53, on this,—‘when David came to Nocah to Ahimelek the priest;’ and the 56th, ‘in the cave of Adullam.’ The 51st, ‘concerning Doeg the Edomite, when he reviled David and Ahimelek;’ the 62nd, ‘when David was fleeing in the wilderness of Edom;’ the 54th, ‘when the Ziphites reviled David:’ the 55th, ‘when the Philistines took him in Gath:’ the 9th and 50th, ‘when Nathan the prophet came to him and rebuked him;’ the 3rd and 10th, ‘when he was fleeing from before Absalom his son;’ the 7th and 11th, ‘because of the words of Hushai when he went to frustrate the counsel of Ahithophel.’ Behold, it is clear from these histories and from those that are like them, that the psalms are not arranged in the Book of Psalms as they were originally written, and according to the time in which each of them was spoken.

“*The scholium of holy Hippolytus ends.*”

The space we have devoted to the preceding extracts will render it impracticable for us to conclude our quotations. We shall therefore close the present paper with an observation or two upon the passage just given, and a few words about the remaining fragments here given from Hippolytus. The remainder of the volume will furnish us with sufficient gleanings for a subsequent paper.

It will be noticed that while Hippolytus clearly makes the Septuagint the basis of his remarks upon the Book of Psalms, he does not seem to be aware of the existence of the supernumerary or 151st psalm, now extant in that version. He was well aware of the different authorship of the individual psalms, and gives a reasonable explanation of their not appearing in chronological order, and of their division into five books. He relies upon the inscriptions as historically correct, but it is observable that they do not in all cases correspond with those now to be found in ordinary editions of the Greek.^p

For the other fragments of Hippolytus, they need not long detain us. There is a short extract from the Exposition of the Song of Songs, in somewhat inflated and fanciful style.^q Next comes a piece, also brief, headed, “Of Hippolytus, bishop and martyr. From a Discourse on the Resurrection, to Mammæa, the queen, for she was mother of Alexander, who was at that time emperor of the Romans. Now the cause of the heresy of the Nicolaitans was Nicholas, one of the deacons who were originally chosen, as is shewn in the Acts,” etc. This passage

^p We may remind the reader that in enumerating the psalms, the numbering of the Heb. and LXX is followed by Hippolytus.

^q Hippolytus is known to have commented upon the Canticles.

has been already published in English, and is valuable on two accounts especially : first, as identifying the princess, to whom one of his works was addressed, commonly called *ad Severinam*, and shewing that Origen was not the only Christian teacher from whom she received instruction ; and as giving us the subject of the treatise thus identified. There can be no doubt of the genuineness of this fragment, which is quite in the manner of Hippolytus.

The next piece "of Hippolytus the bishop upon the Passover," reads so much like a famous passage which has been ascribed to a number of authors, including Irenæus and Melito, that we may reasonably doubt its originality, although from a very ancient manuscript. This is followed by a piece with which the name of Hippolytus is well known to be connected—a calculation as to the time of the Passover (Easter). After this comes a short extract from an explanation of the four animals which Ezekiel saw praising God. The animals are the four evangelists. The one with the face of an ox is Luke ; that with the face of a lion is Matthew ; that with the face of a man is Mark ; and the one like an eagle is John. The last extract is entitled "of Hippolytus of Rome," on a passage in the genealogy of Christ as given by Matthew. The title of this deserves to be noticed.

All the extracts yet enumerated occupy about ninety pages, and the reader will easily infer how valuable are the additions which we derive from them to our stock of patristic information. And many volumes of such extracts might be published from the mass of Syriac manuscripts in the British Museum alone, to say nothing of what exists in other collections, in this country even, as at Oxford and Cambridge.* Including copies of the Holy Scriptures and liturgical works, *there are in the British Museum alone more than six hundred volumes of Syrian Manuscripts*. Many of these represent two or more works, and altogether represent more than two hundred authors. We have before us a list of authors whose works are given or quoted in these volumes ; it is not complete, and only includes the names found by the writer of this, amounting to about two hundred. Many of the writings thus preserved to us are of great value and importance to Biblical literature, and we ardently desire that every effort should be made to bring the

* The Oxford and Cambridge MSS. deserve to be looked into, as also do those in the Imperial Library at Paris. What we have seen convinces us that these have been too much neglected. We fancy, for example, that something from Bardesanes may turn up at Cambridge. *Verbum sat*. There is there also a MS. of several of the VIII books of the pseudo-Clement.

knowledge of them to those who are interested in them. The little that has been done in this way is an earnest of what we may yet expect, and we cordially welcome every new project to publish these texts. Hitherto various difficulties have prevented more from being attempted, especially in the translation and elucidation of texts, but we hope that the zeal and perseverance of Syriac students will overcome these difficulties, and that these precious remains will be rescued from oblivion.

B. H. C.

ANALYSIS OF THE EMBLEMS OF ST. JOHN.—Rev. vii.

(Continued from No. XIII., p. 143.)

IN proceeding to analyse the emblems described in the seventh chapter, we must bear in mind that precisely the same reasoning applies to them as to those in the preceding chapter, in so far as it tends to shew that they were the substance of a portion of the indorsement on the back of the sealed roll, and not part of the writing on its inner surface; for the last of the seals has not yet been broken so as to admit of the separation of the two rollers and the exposure of the inner surface, that its writing might be read.

We may also, as in the former instance, conclude that the reason why the substance of the seventh chapter was written on the back instead of the face of the roll was to indicate that it was a repetition, in symbol, of a prophecy already existing in words.

The first in this new series of emblems (for such it must be considered) is described by the apostle in these words: "And after these things, I saw four angels standing on the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of the earth, that the wind should not blow on the earth, nor on the sea, nor on any tree." The word here translated "earth" ought to be rendered "land" throughout the sentence; for it is obviously used in contradistinction to the sea. Daniel, speaking of the four winds, calls them "the four winds of heaven;" but the phrase "four winds of the land," evidently means four winds blowing from the four quarters upon some particular land; for the expression would obviously be inaccurate, as applied to the whole earth. There is a grammatical difficulty connected with the last clause of the verse which has led Bloomfield to suppose that we should read "nor *shake* every tree," a conjecture which appears very plausible. The word rendered